

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 2627  
Docket No.: 1293.1071DDC

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Jung-wan KO et al.

Application No. 10/779,767

Group Art Unit: 2627

Confirmation No. 1606

Filed: February 18, 2004

Examiner: Kim Kwok Chu

For: RECORDING MEDIUM FOR STORING WRITE PROTECTION INFORMATION AND  
WRITE PROTECTION METHOD THEREOF

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attention: **BOX AF**


Sir:

In the telephone interview conducted on April 15, 2009, the Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the recited limitation of claims 1 and 13, "a plurality of identical write protection information is stored in physically separate locations." The Examiner suggested that the Applicants amend the claims to specify that the plurality of write protection information is for the purpose of backup and redundancy, while the overwrite prevention information in the cited prior art (Ro) is for protecting corresponding recording data. In response, the Applicants' representative argued that the cited prior art reference (Ro) does not disclose a plurality of identical write protection information, as the plurality of overwrite prevention information in Ro are different in at least the Position Data field.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 5 / 15 / 09

By:   
Fadi N. Kiblawi  
Registration No. 61,973

1400 Eye St., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510